

# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: 700 SOUTH 1600 EAST PCE PLUME

EPA ID: UTD981548985

HE Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID): 09/30/18

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

New site listed on the Final NPL.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>
		Yes	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Aguilar, Mark

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: 700 SOUTH 1600 EAST PCE PLUME

EPA ID: UTD981548985

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 09/30/18

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

New site listed on the Final NPL

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Aguilar, Mark

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: ACM SMELTER AND REFINERY

EPA ID: MTD093291599

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Not Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/31/26

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 03/31/30

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Current human exposure not controlled.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Coleman, Charles

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: ACM SMELTER AND REFINERY

EPA ID: MTD093291599

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 03/31/21

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Insufficient data to determine contaminated groundwater migration under control status.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Answer: <u>Yes</u>			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?	Yes	
	Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	

Remedial Project Manager Coleman, Charles

Date Completed



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS

EPA ID: CO7570090038

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 04/06/17

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/34

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Annual Update

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Davis, Natasha

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: AIR FORCE PLANT PJKS

EPA ID: CO7570090038

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Davis, Natasha	Date Completed
-----------------------------------------	----------------

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: ANACONDA ALUMINUM CO COLUMBIA FALLS REDUCTION EPA ID: MTD057561763

### PLANT

HE Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID): 12/31/23

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

An Administrative Order on Consent for RI/FS was recently signed. Field investigations are planned for 2016. Once data has been collected and validated, a conceptual site model will be developed which will show all the human exposure pathways. This is anticipated to be developed in 2017.

Skip to Step 5	No	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
		↓ Yes		
		Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
		↓ No		
		Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
		↓ Yes		
		Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
		↓ Yes		
		Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
			Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site? Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Cirian, Mike

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: ANACONDA ALUMINUM CO COLUMBIA FALLS REDUCTION EPA ID: MTD057561763

## PLANT

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 12/31/23

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Insufficient Data</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager <u>Cirian, Mike</u>	Date Completed
----------------------------------------------	----------------

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: ANACONDA CO. SMELTER

EPA ID: MTD093291656

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Not Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 12/31/20

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/20

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Update based on the 2013 CSOU ROD Amendment

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Coleman, Charles

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: ANACONDA CO. SMELTER

EPA ID: MTD093291656

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/21/16

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Changes based on 2011 ARWWS ROD Amendment and 12/31/2015 Long-Term Groundwater Management QAPP.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI	
Insufficient Data/No		Yes		
Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		Yes		
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		No		
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		No		
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		

Remedial Project Manager Coleman, Charles

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: ARSENIC TRIOXIDE SITE

EPA ID: NDD980716963

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/19

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Performance standard for Arsenic in drinking water has been lowered, effective January 2006. Rural users whose wells contain arsenic over MCL have been connected to rural water system (unless they refused to allow connection).

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site? Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Costanzi, Fran

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: ARSENIC TRIOXIDE SITE

EPA ID: NDD980716963

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

This is not a typical GW plume. Arsenic contamination will not-can not be dealt with in a typical fashion; GW extraction or treatment. Individual homes are addressed by a central water distribution system.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI	
Answer: Yes				
Insufficient Data/No	Yes			
	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?			
	Answer: Yes			
	Reference Doc(s):			
	Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	
	Answer: Yes			
	Reference Doc(s):			
	Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	
	Answer: Yes			
	Reference Doc(s):			
	Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?	No		
	Answer: No			
	Reference Doc(s):			
	Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.	No		
	Answer:			
	Reference Doc(s):			
	Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?	No		
	Answer: Yes			
	Reference Doc(s):			
	Yes			
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		
		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control		

Remedial Project Manager Costanzi, Fran

Date Completed



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: BARKER HUGHESVILLE MINING DISTRICT

EPA ID: MT6122307485

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 03/31/30

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Removal action. Absence of permanent residents in close proximity to mine wastes.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Hoogerheide, Roger

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: BARKER HUGHESVILLE MINING DISTRICT

EPA ID: MT6122307485

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date: 12/31/29

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Changed as a result of planning future activities in CERCLIS. New dates reflects completion of remedial action at the site.  
Groundwater is known to exceed ecological risk-based levels (in Galena Creek drainage and upper Dry Fork drainage) and it migrates to surface water.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: Yes		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Yes			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	

Remedial Project Manager Hoogerheide, Roger

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: BASIN MINING AREA

EPA ID: MTD982572562

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 06/30/22

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Changed as a result of a data quality review and reassessment completed on 11/10/05 by the site RPM and the Montana Office Director.

People can access contaminated soils and waters in the drainage under a recreational scenario.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>Yes</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Archer, Allie

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: BASIN MINING AREA

EPA ID: MTD982572562

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date: 06/30/22

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Changed as a result of a data quality review and reassessment completed on 11/10/05 by the site RPM and the Montana Office Director.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: Yes		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Yes			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
Yes			
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		

Remedial Project Manager Archer, Allie

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: BAXTER/UNION PACIFIC TIE TREATING

EPA ID: WYD061112470

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/00

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Protective remedy in place.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: BAXTER/UNION PACIFIC TIE TREATING

EPA ID: WYD061112470

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: BONITA PEAK MINING DISTRICT

EPA ID: CON000802497

HE Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID): 12/31/18

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Skip to Step 5	No	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
		↓ Yes		
		Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
		↓ No		
		Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
		↓ Yes		
		Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
		↓ Yes		
		Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
			Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager	Thomas, Rebecca	Date Completed
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: BONITA PEAK MINING DISTRICT

EPA ID: CON000802497

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 12/31/18

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Insufficient Data</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

<b>Remedial Project Manager</b> Thomas, Rebecca	<b>Date Completed</b>
-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------



# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: BOUNTIFUL/WOODS CROSS 5TH S. PCE PLUME

EPA ID: UT0001119296

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 06/30/27

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Our assessment is based on the HHRA and RI/FS. These reports are now completed; therefore, we have sufficient data to determine the Human Exposure control status.

Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s): FINAL FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY FORMER W.S. HATCH CO. FACILITY (INCLUDES OVERSIZED FIGURES, MAPS)

No

Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Yes

Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s): FINAL FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY FORMER W.S. HATCH CO. FACILITY (INCLUDES OVERSIZED FIGURES, MAPS)

Yes

Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

No

No

Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s): FINAL FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY FORMER W.S. HATCH CO. FACILITY (INCLUDES OVERSIZED FIGURES, MAPS)

Yes

Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s): FINAL FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY FORMER W.S. HATCH CO. FACILITY (INCLUDES OVERSIZED FIGURES, MAPS)

No

Current Human Exposures Not Controlled

Yes

Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

No

Current Human Exposures Controlled

Yes

Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?

Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).

Remedial Project Manager Garcia, Sam

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: BOUNTIFUL/WOODS CROSS 5TH S. PCE PLUME

EPA ID: UT0001119296

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date: 09/30/20

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

The RI identified three sources of contamination PCE, TCE, and MTBE. On OU2, the contaminated groundwater plume has expanded horizontally.

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: Yes	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Garcia, Sam

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: BRODERICK WOOD PRODUCTS

EPA ID: COD000110254

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/35

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Groundwater sampling results have shown that there is no longer unacceptable human exposures. Info did not reflect current situation that groundwater sampling results have shown that there is no longer unacceptable human exposures in the Arapahoe Aquifer.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site? Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: BRODERICK WOOD PRODUCTS

EPA ID: COD000110254

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			
	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager	Sacenz, Armando	Date Completed
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: CALIFORNIA GULCH

EPA ID: COD980717938

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Not Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/31/21

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/50

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

N/C

Skip to Step 5	No	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
		↓ Yes		
		Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
		↓ No		
		Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
		↓ Yes		
		Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
		↓ Yes		
		Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
			Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Kiefer, Linda

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: CALIFORNIA GULCH

EPA ID: COD980717938

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/21/16

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

The Sitewide Water Quality OUI2 ROD is monitoring remedy with a technical impractical waiver for groundwater. Conditions are monitored as part of the remedy.

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: Yes	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Kiefer, Linda

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: CAPTAIN JACK MILL

EPA ID: COD981551427

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/21

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

The surface remedy is completed. Exposures due to solid waste are controlled. The sub-surface remedy is underway and will address water contamination.

No	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	Skip to Step 5	
	Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled	
↓ Yes			
		No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Jenkins, Joy

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: CAPTAIN JACK MILL

EPA ID: COD981551427

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 03/31/18

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Site is moved from insufficient data to not under controlled due to draft RI with no remedy selected.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI	
		Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):			
		Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	
		Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Insufficient Data</u> Reference Doc(s):	No		
		Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No		
		Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	
		Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No		
		Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		
		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control		

Remedial Project Manager Jenkins, Joy

Date Completed



# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: CARPENTER SNOW CREEK MINING DISTRICT

EPA ID: MT0001096353

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Not Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 12/31/26

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/26

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

2009 ROD for OUI required cleanup of residential properties in Neihart.

Skip to Step 5	No	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
		Yes		
		Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
		No		
		Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
		Yes		
		Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
		Yes		
		Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
			Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Hoogerheide, Roger

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: CARPENTER SNOW CREEK MINING DISTRICT

EPA ID: MT0001096353

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date: 12/31/26

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Changed as a result of planning future activities in CERCLIS. New date reflects completion of remedial action at the site. Ground water is known to exceed ecological risk-based levels (in Carpenter Creek drainage) and it migrates to surface water.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Answer: Yes			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?	Yes	
	Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
	Answer: No Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status		Yes	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Hoogerheide, Roger

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: CENTRAL CITY, CLEAR CREEK

EPA ID: COD980717557

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Not Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 09/30/19

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/50

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Data Correction

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Sims, Leslie

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: CENTRAL CITY, CLEAR CREEK

EPA ID: COD980717557

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/31/22

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

<b>Remedial Project Manager</b> Sims, Leslie	<b>Date Completed</b>
----------------------------------------------	-----------------------

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: CHEMICAL SALES CO.

EPA ID: COD007431620

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/20

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Changes based on 3rd Five Year Report.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: CHEMICAL SALES CO.

EPA ID: COD007431620

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Changes based on annual groundwater reports and 5 YR Review Reports.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Yes			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: COLORADO SMELTER

EPA ID: CON000802700

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Not Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/31/27

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 03/31/35

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	<p>Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<p>Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
Skip to Step 5	<p>Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		
	↓ Yes		
	<p>Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<p>Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<p>Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?</p> <p>Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).</p>		

Remedial Project Manager    Forrest, Sabrina	Date Completed
----------------------------------------------	----------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: COLORADO SMELTER

EPA ID: CON000802700

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 03/31/20

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

RI Work Plan development has been initiated and GW will be investigated.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Yes			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):		
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	
Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	

Remedial Project Manager Forrest, Sabrina

Date Completed



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: DAVENPORT AND FLAGSTAFF SMELTERS

EPA ID: UTD988075719

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/21/16

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 03/21/16

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

The remedial action for OU2 has been completed and there are no unacceptable human exposures. The only remaining work left on the site is to put institutional controls (IC's) in place so human health exposure will remain controlled in the long term.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site? Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Waterman, Erna

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: DAVENPORT AND FLAGSTAFF SMELTERS

EPA ID: UTD988075719

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Final OU2 human health risk assessment - No groundwater exposure.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Yes			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	

Remedial Project Manager Waterman, Erna

Date Completed

# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: DENVER RADIUM SITE

EPA ID: COD980716955

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

FCOR

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: DENVER RADIUM SITE

EPA ID: COD980716955

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Five years of groundwater monitoring needed after construction completion for OU#8 reached in 2006

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Yes			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			
Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control			
		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	

Remedial Project Manager Sacenz, Armando

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: EAGLE MINE

EPA ID: COD081961518

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 03/31/20

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

<b>Remedial Project Manager</b> Miller, Jamie	<b>Date Completed</b>
-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: EAGLE MINE

EPA ID: COD081961518

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Miller, Jamic

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: EAST HELENA SITE

EPA ID: MTD006230346

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 06/30/30

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Changed as a result of a data quality review and reassessment completed on 11/10/05 by the site RPM and the Montana Office Director.

No	Skip to Step 5	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
		↓ Yes		
		Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
		↓ No		
		Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):		
		↓ Yes		
		Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
		↓ Yes		
		Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
			Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Burns, Betsy

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: EAST HELENA SITE

EPA ID: MTD006230346

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/15/16

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Groundwater migration has transferred to RCRA program. Per Rich Norris email dated 11/30/06.

<p>Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
<p>Insufficient Data/No</p> <p>Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		Yes	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status</p>		Yes	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
<p>Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control</p>			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Burns, Betsy

Date Completed



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE

EPA ID: SD2571924644

HE Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID): 09/30/18

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

This change in as a result of the 2015 Five Year Reviews. Data gaps: PFCs 1,4 dioxane and perchlorate.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>
		Yes	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Smith, Pat

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE

EPA ID: SD2571924644

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 09/30/18

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

This change in as a result of the 2015 Five Year Reviews. Data gaps: PFCS 1,4 dioxane and perchlorate. SEMS document number 1574577.

As of September 2016, there is insufficient information available to determine the Ground Water Migration Under Control status at the Tooele Army Depot Superfund Site, because the groundwater investigation is ongoing. This does not mean that unacceptable exposures are occurring.

Ground water mapping, modeling, and active treatment has taken place under the RCRA permit. A ground water management area is in place, with a buffer zone around the plume. No ground water exposures are taking place. Additional groundwater investigations to evaluate the potential for Monitored Natural Attenuation are expected to be complete by 2020.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: Insufficient Data

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Smith, Pat

Date Completed

# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: EUREKA MILLS

EPA ID: UT0002240158

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/40

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

EPA completed cleanup of all properties within the City of Eureka in October 2010. A total of more than 700 properties have been addressed by remedial and removal programs since 2001. Additionally, construction was completed on the stabilization and capping of thirteen large mine waste areas and construction of sediment ponds and other drainage control features. The capping and construction of these features will prevent surface runoff with elevated concentrations of metals from contaminating cleaned up areas.

In late 2011, a Record of Decision was signed for Operable Unit 4 which documents EPA's selected remedy to address site groundwater, site surface water and ecological risks within undeveloped areas of the site. The remedy calls for no additional active remediation.

Between 2000 and 2008, blood sampling identified approximately 50 children with elevated blood-lead levels. Public health actions included information programs, periodic blood-lead testing of children, and a program for evaluating sources of indoor lead exposure. Recent blood test results indicate that the lead levels in Eureka children have dropped considerably.

<p>Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status	
↓ Yes			
<p>Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?</p> <p>Answer: No</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved	
↓ No			
<p>Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer: No</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Skip to Step 5	
↓ Yes			
<p>Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No		Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
↓ Yes			
<p>Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?</p> <p>Answer: No</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
	Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
<p>Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?</p> <p>Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).</p>			

Remedial Project Manager	Saenz, Armando	Date Completed
--------------------------	----------------	----------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: EUREKA MILLS

EPA ID: UT0002240158

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

The June 2010 RI for this OU has been completed. Contaminants in the groundwater do not exceed MCLs or ALs.

<p>Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data/No	<p>Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Reference Doc(s): Operable Unit 4 Groundwater, Surface Water, and Ecological Risk Remedial Investigation Report Express Link CD with attachments.</p>	Yes	
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?</p> <p>Answer: No</p> <p>Reference Doc(s): Operable Unit 4 Groundwater, Surface Water, and Ecological Risk Remedial Investigation Report Express Link CD with attachments.</p>	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	<p>Yes</p>	Yes	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: F.E. WARREN AIR FORCE BASE

EPA ID: WY5571924179

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/18

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Annual Update

Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

**Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status**

↓ Yes

Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

**Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved**

↓ No

No

Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

↓ Yes

Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

**Current Human Exposures Not Controlled**

↓ Yes

Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

No

**Current Human Exposures Controlled**

Yes

**Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place**

Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?

Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).

Remedial Project Manager Davis, Natasha

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: F.E. WARREN AIR FORCE BASE

EPA ID: WY5571924179

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Davis, Natasha

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: FIVE POINTS PCE PLUME

EPA ID: UTN000802654

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/21/16

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/23

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

RI/FS completed. There is sufficient data to determine human exposure control status.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Garcia, Sam

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: FIVE POINTS PCE PLUME

EPA ID: UTN000802654

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date: 09/30/23

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

The RI/FS is completed.

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Garcia, Sam

Date Completed



# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: FLAT CREEK IMM

EPA ID: MT0012694970

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Not Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/31/23

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 03/31/23

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

	<div>Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):</div>	No	<div>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</div>
	<div>↓ Yes</div>		
	<div>Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):</div>	Yes	<div>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</div>
	<div>↓ No</div>		
Skip to Step 5	<div>Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):</div>		
	<div>↓ Yes</div>		
	<div>Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):</div>	No	<div>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</div>
	<div>↓ Yes</div>		
	<div>Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):</div>	No	<div>Current Human Exposures Controlled</div>
		Yes	<div>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</div>
	<div>Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).</div>		

Remedial Project Manager	Archer, Allie	Date Completed
--------------------------	---------------	----------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: FLAT CREEK IMM

EPA ID: MT0012694970

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 12/31/22

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Archer, Allie

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: GILT EDGE MINE

EPA ID: SDD987673985

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/21

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Surface remedy at OUI RA is beginning in 2016.

Skip to Step 5	No	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
		Yes		
		Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
		No		
		Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):		
		Yes		
		Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
		Yes		
		Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
			Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Jenkins, Joy

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: GILT EDGE MINE

EPA ID: SDD987673985

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/21/16

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Known groundwater seeps exist at the site.

<p>Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
<p>Insufficient Data/No</p> <p>Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		Yes	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status</p>		Yes	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Jenkins, Joy

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: HILL AIR FORCE BASE

EPA ID: UT0571724350

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Not Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 09/30/19

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/19

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Basewide Indoor Air Sampling is ongoing. Vapor removal systems have been installed and based on the results of future sampling more vapor removal systems may be installed.

Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Yes

Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

No

No

Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

No

Current Human Exposures Not Controlled

Yes

Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Current Human Exposures Controlled

Yes

Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?

Answer: Yes Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).

Remedial Project Manager Bourgeois, Sandra

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: HILL AIR FORCE BASE

EPA ID: UT0571724350

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			
	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Bourgeois, Sandra

Date Completed

# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: IDAHO POLE CO.

EPA ID: MTD006232276

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/22

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Change resulted in the 2015 Five Year Review.

<p>Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b></p>
↓ Yes		
<p>Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b></p>
↓ No		
<p>Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Skip to Step 5</b></p>
↓ Yes		
<p>Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b></p>
↓ Yes		
<p>Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b></p>
<p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b></p>
<p>Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).</p>		

Remedial Project Manager Hoogerheide, Roger

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: IDAHO POLE CO.

EPA ID: MTD006232276

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Hoogerheide, Roger

Date Completed



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: INTERMOUNTAIN WASTE OIL REFINERY

EPA ID: UT0001277359

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/14

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Groundwater contamination under MCLs for over 6 months.

Skip to Step 5	No	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
		Yes		
		Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
		No		
		Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):		
		Yes		
		Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
		Yes		
		Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
			Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Waterman, Erna

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: INTERMOUNTAIN WASTE OIL REFINERY

EPA ID: UT0001277359

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Groundwater sampling is below MCLs. There has not been 6 consecutive months of sampling below MCLs as required by O&M plan in order to shut down system.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: Yes		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Yes			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		

Remedial Project Manager Waterman, Erna

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: INTERNATIONAL SMELTING AND REFINING

EPA ID: UTD093120921

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/21/16

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 03/21/16

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Site has been deleted from the NPL.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Waterman, Erna

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: INTERNATIONAL SMELTING AND REFINING

EPA ID: UTD093120921

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Long term O&M plan is completed. The remaining ICs will be implemented in the next year.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Waterman, Erna

Date Completed

# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: JACOBS SMELTER

EPA ID: UT0002391472

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Not Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 09/30/22

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/22

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

<p>Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b></p>
↓ Yes		
<p>Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b></p>
↓ No		
<p>Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b></p>
↓ Yes		
<p>Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b></p>
↓ Yes		
<p>Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b></p>
<p>Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?</p> <p>Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b></p>

<p><b>Remedial Project Manager</b> Schmidt, Andrew</p>	<p><b>Date Completed</b></p>
--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: JACOBS SMELTER  
GW Survey Status: Not a GW Site

EPA ID: UT0002391472

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: No	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Not a Groundwater Site Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			
	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Schmidt, Andrew	Date Completed
------------------------------------------	----------------

# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: KENNECOTT (NORTH ZONE)

EPA ID: UTD070926811

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/07/16

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 06/30/26

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Site is HEUC.

Skip to Step 5	No	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
		↓ Yes		
		Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
		↓ No		
		Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
		↓ Yes		
		Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
		↓ Yes		
		Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
			Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Fiedler, Kerri

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: KENNECOTT (NORTH ZONE)

EPA ID: UTD070926811

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date: 06/30/26

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

GW not under control.

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Fiedler, Kerri

Date Completed



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: KENNECOTT (SOUTH ZONE)

EPA ID: UTD000826404

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/10

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

HE is under control and protective remedy in place.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Fiedler, Kerri

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: KENNECOTT (SOUTH ZONE)

EPA ID: UTD000826404

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

GW under control.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Fiedler, Kerri

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: LIBBY ASBESTOS SITE

EPA ID: MT0009083840

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Not Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 12/31/20

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/20

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Removal Actions ongoing.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Zinner, Dania

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: LIBBY ASBESTOS SITE

EPA ID: MT0009083840

GW Survey Status: Not a GW Site

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: No	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Not a Groundwater Site Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Zinner, Dania

Date Completed

# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: LIBBY GROUND WATER CONTAMINATION

EPA ID: MTD980502736

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/30

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Change estimated Long-Term Human Health Protected date.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Schmidt, Andrew

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: LIBBY GROUND WATER CONTAMINATION

EPA ID: MTD980502736

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Schmidt, Andrew

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: LINCOLN PARK

EPA ID: COD042167858

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/17

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Soil remediation in Lincoln Park completed. No exposure pathway to contaminated GW. Active mill facility will be decommissioned in accordance with NRC requirements when license is terminated.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):		<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>
		Yes	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Aguilar, Mark

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: LINCOLN PARK

EPA ID: COD042167858

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	<p>Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	<p>Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager	Aguilar, Mark	Date Completed
--------------------------	---------------	----------------



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: LOCKWOOD SOLVENT GROUND WATER PLUME

EPA ID: MT0007623052

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/23

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Municipal water supply and indoor air vapor mitigation measures taken. Worker exposures not considered to be reasonably expected.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	↓ Yes	
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes		Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site? Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Hoogerheide, Roger

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: LOCKWOOD SOLVENT GROUND WATER PLUME

EPA ID: MT0007623052

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Changed as a result of a data quality review and reassessment completed on 11/10/05 by the site RPM and the Montana Office Director.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: Yes		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI	
Insufficient Data/No		Yes		
Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		Yes		
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		No		
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		No		
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		

Remedial Project Manager Hoogerheide, Roger

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: LOWRY LANDFILL

EPA ID: COD980499248

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/29

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	<div>Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):</div>	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<div>Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):</div>	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
Skip to Step 5	<div>Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):</div>	No	
	↓ Yes		
	<div>Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):</div>	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<div>Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):</div>	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<div>Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).</div>		

Remedial Project Manager    Sims, Leslie	Date Completed
------------------------------------------	----------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: LOWRY LANDFILL

EPA ID: COD980499248

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager	Sims, Leslie	Date Completed
--------------------------	--------------	----------------

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: MARSHALL LANDFILL

EPA ID: COD980499255

HE Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID): 03/31/17

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Due to emerging contaminate issue (1,4-Dioxane), additional groundwater wells were installed and additional data was collected. The new wells raised questions about the ground water flow pathways.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b> <b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No		
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site? Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Schmidt, Andrew

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: MARSHALL LANDFILL

EPA ID: COD980499255

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 03/31/17

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Due to emerging contaminate issue (1,4-Dioxane), additional groundwater wells were installed and additional data was collected. The new wells raised questions about the ground water flow pathways.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Answer: Yes			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?	Yes	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Answer: Insufficient Data Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	

Remedial Project Manager Schmidt, Andrew

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: MIDVALE SLAG

EPA ID: UTD081834277

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 06/30/29

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

There are currently no uncontrolled human exposure at the Midvale Slag site. The remedial action began on OU2 in February 2005. This RA is complete, with the final walk through conducted on June 26, 2006. The final ICs for development are incorporated into Midvale City's ordinances. The ready for reuse is completed.

Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
↓ Yes			
Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):		Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
↓ No			
Skip to Step 5	Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Yes	
Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			
Remedial Project Manager Fiedler, Kerri		Date Completed	

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: MIDVALE SLAG

EPA ID: UTD081834277

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

32 inch diameter groundwater wells were installed to depths ranging from 10 to 109 feet. This network of wells were required to meet objectives in the Midvale OU2 ROD and the groundwater monitoring plan (2004).

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: Yes	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Fiedler, Kerri

Date Completed



# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: MILLTOWN RESERVOIR SEDIMENTS

EPA ID: MTD980717565

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/26

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Changed as a result of a data quality review and reassessment completed on 11/10/05 by the site RPM and the Montana Office Director.

<p>Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b></p>
<p>↓ Yes</p>		
<p>Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b></p>
<p>↓ No</p>		
<p>Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b></p>
<p>↓ Yes</p>		
<p>Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b></p>
<p>↓ Yes</p>		
<p>Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b></p>
<p>Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b></p>

<p>Remedial Project Manager Sparks, Sara</p>	<p>Date Completed</p>
----------------------------------------------	-----------------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: MILLTOWN RESERVOIR SEDIMENTS

EPA ID: MTD980717565

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Changed as a result of a data quality review and reassessment completed on 11/10/05 by the site RPM and the Montana Office Director.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: Yes		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI	
Insufficient Data/No		Yes		
Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		Yes		
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		No		
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		No		
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		No		
Insufficient Data		Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		
		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control		

Remedial Project Manager Sparks, Sara

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: MINOT LANDFILL

EPA ID: NDD980959548

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

No exposure pathway affecting human health.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Costanzi, Fran

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: MINOT LANDFILL

EPA ID: NDD980959548

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Costanzi, Fran	Date Completed
-----------------------------------------	----------------

# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: MONTANA POLE AND TREATING

EPA ID: MTD006230635

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/28

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Change the estimated long-term human health protected date.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No		
↓ Yes			
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Archer, Allie

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: MONTANA POLE AND TREATING

EPA ID: MTD006230635

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?  
Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?  
Answer: No  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Archer, Allie

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: MONTICELLO MILL TAILINGS (USDOE)

EPA ID: UT3890090035

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/45

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

The remedy is operating as intended per OU3 ESD, 2009

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s): MONTICELLO MILL TAILINGS SITE, OPERABLE UNIT III ANNUAL GROUNDWATER REPORT MAY 2010 THROUGH APR. 2011, APPENDICES A-H (INCLUDED ON CD) AUG 2011 (TRANSMITTAL LETTER DATED 9/27/11 ATTACHED).	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site? Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Moritz, Vera

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: MONTICELLO MILL TAILINGS (USDOE)

EPA ID: UT3890090035

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

<b>Remedial Project Manager</b> Moritz, Vera	<b>Date Completed</b>
----------------------------------------------	-----------------------



# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: MONTICELLO RADIOACTIVELY CONTAMINATED

EPA ID: UTD980667208

## PROPERTIES

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/45

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Remedial action is complete. Institutional controls are in place.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager	Moritz, Vera	Date Completed
--------------------------	--------------	----------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: MONTICELLO RADIOACTIVELY CONTAMINATED

EPA ID: UTD980667208

## PROPERTIES

GW Survey Status: Not a GW Site

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: No	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Not a Groundwater Site Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Moritz, Vera	Date Completed
---------------------------------------	----------------

# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: MOUAT INDUSTRIES

EPA ID: MTD021997689

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/21/16

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 03/21/16

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Remedy is in place. Confirmed by 4/15/2013 Five Year Review.

<p>Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b></p>
↓ Yes		
<p>Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b></p>
↓ No		
<p>Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Skip to Step 5</b></p>
↓ Yes		
<p>Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b></p>
↓ Yes		
<p>Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b></p>
<p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b></p>
<p>Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).</p>		

Remedial Project Manager Hoogerheide, Roger

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: MOUAT INDUSTRIES

EPA ID: MTD021997689

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?  
Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?  
Answer: No  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Hoogerheide, Roger

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: MURRAY SMELTER

EPA ID: UTD980951420

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/18

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Based on the first 5YR review dated September 2003 the site is under controlled and protective remedy in place for human health.

Skip to Step 5	No	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
		↓ Yes		
		Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
		↓ No		
		Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):		
		↓ Yes		
		Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
		↓ Yes		
		Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
			Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Waterman, Erna

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: MURRAY SMELTER

EPA ID: UTD980951420

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Site is considered GW under controlled based on the documents provided.

<p>Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data/No	<p>Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Reference Doc(s): GROUNDWATER AND SURFACE WATER MONITORING REPORT FOURTH QUARTER 2007</p>		
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Reference Doc(s): GROUNDWATER AND SURFACE WATER MONITORING REPORT FOURTH QUARTER 2007</p>	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Reference Doc(s): GROUNDWATER AND SURFACE WATER MONITORING REPORT FOURTH QUARTER 2007</p>	No	
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Reference Doc(s): (MURRAY SMELTER RECORD OF DECISION (ROD); INCLUDES TABLES, FIGURES, APPENDICES A, B, AND C, AND CERTIFICATION)</p>	No	
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Reference Doc(s): GROUNDWATER AND SURFACE WATER MONITORING REPORT FOURTH QUARTER 2007</p>	No	
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Reference Doc(s): SAMPLING &amp; ANALYSIS PLAN FOR GROUNDWATER &amp; SURFACE WATER MONITORING PROGRAMS, FORMER MURRAY SMELTER SITE (11/13/2000 COVER LETTER ATTACHED)</p>	No	
<p>Yes</p>			
<p>Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status</p>		<p>Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control</p>	
		<p>Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control</p>	

Remedial Project Manager Waterman, Erna

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: MYSTERY BRIDGE RD/U.S. HIGHWAY 20

EPA ID: WYD981546005

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

No exposure pathway affecting human health-4th Five Year Review report.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Schmidt, Andrew

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: MYSTERY BRIDGE RD/U.S. HIGHWAY 20

EPA ID: WYD981546005

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

GW under control based on 4th 5YR Report completed in September 2014.

<p>Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
<p>Insufficient Data/No</p> <p>Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		Yes	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status</p>		Yes	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
<p>Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control</p>			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Schmidt, Andrew

Date Completed



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: NELSON TUNNEL/COMMODORE WASTE ROCK

EPA ID: CON000802630

HE Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID): 03/31/17

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Activity based sampling done for the 2011 RI is being re-evaluated and may be done again to refine the determination on human health exposure.

No	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
	↓ Yes		
Skip to Step 5	Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site? Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Jenkins, Joy

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: NELSON TUNNEL/COMMODORE WASTE ROCK

EPA ID: CON000802630

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 03/31/18

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Additional data evaluation underway.

<p>Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data/No	<p>Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Insufficient Data</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
<p>Yes</p>			
Insufficient Data	<p>Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
<p>Yes</p>			
<p>Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status</p>		<p>Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control</p>	
<p>Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control</p>		<p>Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control</p>	

Remedial Project Manager Jenkins, Joy

Date Completed

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

EPA ID: UT9210020922

**Estimated Under Control Date:**

**Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:** 09/30/19

Status changed due to error in previous data. Site has been construction complete so step 6 should have been "Yes".

<b>Remedial Project Manager</b>	Davis, Natasha	<b>Date Completed</b>
---------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: OGDEN DEFENSE DEPOT (DLA)

EPA ID: UT9210020922

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Davis, Natasha

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: PETROCHEM RECYCLING CORP./EKOTEK PLANT

EPA ID: UTD093119196

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

All hazardous materials above health-based levels were removed from the site & groundwater remediation goals have been obtained. The site is released from unrestricted use and unlimited exposure. The site has been deleted from the NPL.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>	
Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site? Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: PETROCHEM RECYCLING CORP./EKOTEK PLANT

EPA ID: UTD093119196

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

All hazardous materials above health-based levels were removed from the site and GW remediation goals have been met. The site is released for UU/VE and has been deleted from the NPL.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Answer: Yes			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?	Yes	
	Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Answer: No Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: PORTLAND CEMENT (KIILN DUST 2 & 3)

EPA ID: UTD980718670

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Construction is complete. Monitoring system is operational and functional. The natural attenuation remedy is functioning as predicted. Institutional controls are in place to eliminate exposure to contaminated soils and restrict the use of groundwater.

Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

**Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status**

↓ Yes

Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

**Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved**

↓ No

No

Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

↓ Yes

Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

**Current Human Exposures Not Controlled**

↓ Yes

Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

**Current Human Exposures Controlled**

Yes

**Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place**

Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?

Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: PORTLAND CEMENT (KILN DUST 2 & 3)

EPA ID: UTD980718670

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: RICHARDSON FLAT TAILINGS

EPA ID: UTD980952840

HE Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID): 03/31/18

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/14

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>
		Yes	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

<b>Remedial Project Manager</b> Parker, Robert	<b>Date Completed</b>
------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: RICHARDSON FLAT TAILINGS

EPA ID: UTD980952840

GW Survey Status: Not a GW Site

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?  
Answer: No

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?  
Answer: Not a Groundwater Site  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Parker, Robert

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: ROCKY FLATS PLANT (USDOE)

EPA ID: CO7890010526

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/56

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Per construction complete and EPA certification letter.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Yes	
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Moritz, Vera

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: ROCKY FLATS PLANT (USDOE)

EPA ID: CO7890010526

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?  
Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Moritz, Vera

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL (USARMY)

EPA ID: CO5210020769

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/25

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Annual update. Status remain the same.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Hargreaves, Greg

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL (USARMY)

EPA ID: CO5210020769

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Hargreaves, Greg

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: ROSE PARK SLUDGE PIT

EPA ID: UTD980635452

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Construction is complete and institutional control protect waste left in place. The site was deleted from the NPL in June 2003.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: ROSE PARK SLUDGE PIT

EPA ID: UTD980635452

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: SAND CREEK INDUSTRIAL

EPA ID: COD980717953

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/35

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>	
	↓ Yes			
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>	
	↓ No			
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>	
	↓ Yes			
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No			
	↓ Yes	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>
			Yes	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).				

<b>Remedial Project Manager</b> Saenz, Armando	<b>Date Completed</b>
------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: SAND CREEK INDUSTRIAL

EPA ID: COD980717953

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
		Yes	
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
		Yes	
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
		Yes	
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
		Yes	
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
		Yes	
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
		Yes	
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
		Yes	
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			
	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager	Sacenz, Armando	Date Completed
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: SHARON STEEL CORP. (MIDVALE TAILINGS)

EPA ID: UTD980951388

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Construction is complete and institutional controls have been implemented to protect waste left in place.  
The site was deleted from the NPL in September, 2004.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No		
↓ Yes			
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>
		Yes	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site? Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Fiedler, Kerri

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: SHARON STEEL CORP. (MIDVALE TAILINGS)

EPA ID: UTD980951388

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

<b>Remedial Project Manager</b> Fiedler, Kerri	<b>Date Completed</b>
------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: SILVER BOW CREEK/BUTTE AREA

EPA ID: MTD980502777

HE Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID): 03/31/22

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Have not started Westside Soils RI.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>
		Yes	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Greene, Nikia

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: SILVER BOW CREEK/BUTTE AREA

EPA ID: MTD980502777

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Changed as a result of a data quality review and reassessment completed on 11/10/05 by the site RPM and the Montana Office Director.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: Yes		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Yes			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
Yes			
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	

Remedial Project Manager Greene, Nikia

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: SMELTERTOWN SITE

EPA ID: COD983769738

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

This site has met all the human exposure-related cleanup goals.

Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s): FINAL REMOVAL ACTION CLOSE OUT REPORT OU 1,  
REMEDIAL ACTION REPORT OPERABLE UNIT 2

No

Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Yes

Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s): FINAL REMOVAL ACTION CLOSE OUT REPORT OU 1,  
REMEDIAL ACTION REPORT OPERABLE UNIT 2

Yes

Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

No

No

Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Skip to Step 5

Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Current Human Exposures Not Controlled

Yes

Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Current Human Exposures Controlled

Yes

Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  
Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).

Remedial Project Manager Waterman, Erna

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: SMELTERTOWN SITE

EPA ID: COD983769738

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

This site has met all GW cleanup goal.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Waterman, Erna

Date Completed



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: SMUGGLER MOUNTAIN

EPA ID: COD980806277

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Long-Term human health protection was achieved with the deletion of the site on 9/23/99. Also there is no groundwater problem at the site

Skip to Step 5	No	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
		↓ Yes		
		Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
		↓ No		
		Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
		↓ Yes		
		Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
		↓ Yes		
		Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
			Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: SMUGGLER MOUNTAIN

EPA ID: COD980806277

GW Survey Status: Not a GW Site

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: No	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Not a Groundwater Site Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			
	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		
			Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager	Sacenz, Armando	Date Completed
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

EPA ID: MTN000802850

**Estimated Under Control Date:**

**Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:**

An Administrative Order on Consent for RI/FS was recently signed. Field investigations are planned for 2016. Once data has been collected and validated, a conceptual site model will be developed which will show all the human exposure pathways. This is anticipated to be developed in 2017.

<b>Remedial Project Manager</b>	Sparks, Sara	<b>Date Completed</b>
---------------------------------	--------------	-----------------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: SMURFIT-STONE MILL FRENCHTOWN

EPA ID: MTN000802850

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 12/31/21

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
		Yes	
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):		
			Yes
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
			Yes
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	
		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	

Remedial Project Manager Sparks, Sara	Date Completed
---------------------------------------	----------------

# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: STANDARD MINE

EPA ID: CO0002378230

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Not Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 12/31/22

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/25

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

A human health risk assessment has been completed at th site. Results of the risk assessment show an unacceptable human health risk to A&V riders from inhalation of manganese dust.

<p>Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b></p>
<p>↓ Yes</p>		
<p>Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b></p>
<p>↓ No</p>		
<p>Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer: <u>Yes</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b></p>
<p>↓ Yes</p>		
<p>Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer: <u>No</u></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b></p>
<p>↓ Yes</p>		
<p>Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b></p>
<p>Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?</p> <p>Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b></p>

<p>Remedial Project Manager    Progress, Christina</p>	<p>Date Completed</p>
--------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: STANDARD MINE

EPA ID: CO0002378230

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date: 12/31/22

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

USGS and DRMS have completed investigations of underground mine workings and hydrogeologis interactions in mine. Data has been collected that suggest potential groundwater flow paths, therefore EPA has enough data to determine that the groundwater is not under control.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Insufficient Data/No Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s): Yes			
Insufficient Data Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s): Yes		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
Insufficient Data Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s): Yes		No	
Insufficient Data Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s): Yes		No	
Insufficient Data Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s): Yes		No	
Insufficient Data Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s): Yes		No	
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	

Remedial Project Manager Progress, Christina

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: SUMMITVILLE MINE

EPA ID: COD983778432

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/30

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Five-Year Review Report(2015) findings/Institutional Controls are needed for long-term protectiveness.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Costanzi, Fran

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: SUMMITVILLE MINE

EPA ID: COD983778432

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Construction has been completed on the water treatment system as well as surface source controls. Treatment components are functioning and standards are being met. Monitoring is ongoing.

	Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: Yes	No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
	Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):		
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	
	Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Costanzi, Fran

Date Completed



# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: TOOELE ARMY DEPOT (NORTH AREA)

EPA ID: UT3213820894

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/26

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Annual Update

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Smith, Pat

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: TOOELE ARMY DEPOT (NORTH AREA)

EPA ID: UT3213820894

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 03/31/19

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Insufficient data based on current RCRA CMS and Groundwater Flow Model.

As of September 2016, there is insufficient information available to determine the Ground Water Migration Under Control status at the Tooele Army Depot Superfund Site, because the groundwater investigation is ongoing. This does not mean that unacceptable exposures are occurring.

Ground water mapping, modeling, and active treatment has taken place under the RCRA permit. A ground water management area is in place, with a buffer zone around the plume. No ground water exposures are taking place. Additional groundwater investigations to evaluate the potential for Monitored Natural Attenuation are expected to be complete by 2020.

<p>Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
<p>Insufficient Data/No</p> <p>Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		Yes	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?</p> <p>Answer: Insufficient Data</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data</p> <p>Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		No	
<p>Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status</p>		Yes	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Smith, Pat

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: UPPER TENMILE CREEK MINING AREA

EPA ID: MTSFN7578012

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Not Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 09/30/27

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/27

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

95% of residential yards remediation planned complete. Mine waste sites near Rimini and Landmark subdivisions remediation. Mine source adit discharges in Rimini area are the next priority remedial activity to address human exposure concerns.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>	
		Yes	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site? Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager McAdams, Tillman

Date Completed

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: UPPER TENMILE CREEK MINING AREA

EPA ID: MTSFN7578012

**GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control**

**Estimated Under Control Date:** 09/30/27

**Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):**

**Justification Text:** If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Arsenic levels significantly above MCL found in ground water monitoring wells used to identify impact coming from Little Lily Mine. Direction of flow is towards Rimini where the majority of wells have arsenic above MCL. Surface water measurements show high concentrations of arsenic as well.

<p>Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?</p> <p>Answer: <i>Yes</i></p>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Insufficient Data/No	<p>Yes</p> <p>Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?</p> <p>Answer: <i>Yes</i></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>		
Insufficient Data	<p>Yes</p> <p>Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?</p> <p>Answer: <i>Yes</i></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
Insufficient Data	<p>Yes</p> <p>Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?</p> <p>Answer: <i>No</i></p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
Insufficient Data	<p>Yes</p> <p>Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
Insufficient Data	<p>Yes</p> <p>Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
Insufficient Data	<p>Yes</p> <p>Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status	Yes		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

<b>Remedial Project Manager</b> McAdams, Tillman	<b>Date Completed</b>
--------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: URAVAN URANIUM PROJECT (UNION CARBIDE CORP.) EPA ID: COD007063274

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date: 03/17/16

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/19

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Construction completion achieved. Institutional Controls are still needed.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

Remedial Project Manager Costanzi, Fran

Date Completed

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: URAVAN URANIUM PROJECT (UNION CARBIDE CORP.) EPA ID: COD007063274

**GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control**

**Estimated Under Control Date:** 03/17/16

**Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):**

**Justification Text:** If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

ED 002345C 00009006-00138

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: US MAGNESIUM

EPA ID: UTN000802704

HE Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID): 09/30/20

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 09/30/20

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Site was listed onto the NPL November, 2009; RI/FS underway.

Skip to Step 5	No	Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
		↓ Yes		
		Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
		↓ No		
		Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
		↓ Yes		
		Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
		↓ Yes		
		Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
			Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
		Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Wangerud, Ken

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: US MAGNESIUM

EPA ID: UTN000802704

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 09/30/20

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Site was listed onto the NPL November, 2009; RI/FS underway.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
Answer: <u>Yes</u>			
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?	Yes	
	Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?	No	
	Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status		Yes	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status		No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Wangerud, Ken

Date Completed



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: UTAH POWER & LIGHT/AMERICAN BARREL CO.

EPA ID: UTD980667240

HE Survey Status: Current Human Exposure Controlled

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 12/31/35

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: <u>Yes</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>	
↓ Yes			
<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: <u>No</u> Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).			

<b>Remedial Project Manager</b> Saenz, Armando	<b>Date Completed</b>
------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: UTAH POWER & LIGHT/AMERICAN BARREL CO.

EPA ID: UTD980667240

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

No

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: VASQUEZ BOULEVARD AND I-70

EPA ID: CO0002259588

HE Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID): 06/30/17

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved: 06/30/13

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Need final risk assessment/ROD for OU2 and OU3.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: No Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	Yes	<b>Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved</b>
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Not Controlled</b>
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	<b>Current Human Exposures Controlled</b>
		Yes	<b>Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place</b>
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Zinner, Dania

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: VASQUEZ BOULEVARD AND I-70

EPA ID: CO0002259588

GW Survey Status: Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Groundwater Migration Control Status

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID): 03/31/17

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Need final risk assessment/ROD for OU2 and OU3.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: <u>Yes</u>		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI	
		Yes		
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: <u>No</u> Reference Doc(s):			
		Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control	
		Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No		
		Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No		
		Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	
		Yes		
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control	
		Yes		
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status		Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control		

Remedial Project Manager Zinner, Dania

Date Completed

# Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: WASATCH CHEMICAL CO. (LOT 6)

EPA ID: UTD000716399

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Construction is complete. The remedy as designed, constructed, implemented, and operated is protective of human health and the environment. Institutional controls have been implemented to protect waste left in place.

The 4th Five-Year Review recommended sampling of indoor air. Final results are expected by summer 2016.

Skip to Step 5	<p>Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<p>Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<p>Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
<p>Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No		
↓ Yes			
<p>Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>Reference Doc(s):</p>	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled	
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
<p>Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?</p> <p>Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).</p>			

Remedial Project Manager Garcia, Sam	Date Completed
--------------------------------------	----------------

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: WASATCH CHEMICAL CO. (LOT 6)

EPA ID: UTD000716399

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Garcia, Sam

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: WHITEWOOD CREEK

EPA ID: SDD980717136

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

No exposure pathway affecting human health.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Fiedler, Kerri

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: WHITEWOOD CREEK

EPA ID: SDD980717136

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

--

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?  
Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?  
Answer: Yes  
Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?  
Answer: No  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?  
Answer:  
Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Fiedler, Kerri

Date Completed



## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: WILLIAMS PIPE LINE CO. DISPOSAL PIT

EPA ID: SDD000823559

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

No exposure pathway affecting human health.

Skip to Step 5	<b>Step 1.</b> Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	No	Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 2.</b> Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site? Answer: Yes Reference Doc(s):	Yes	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
	↓ No		
	<b>Step 3.</b> Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 4.</b> Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Not Controlled
	↓ Yes		
	<b>Step 5.</b> Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Current Human Exposures Controlled
		Yes	Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place
	<b>Step 6.</b> Are there continuing exposures at the site?  Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).		

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: WILLIAMS PIPE LINE CO. DISPOSAL PIT

EPA ID: SDD000823559

GW Survey Status: Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Site deferred to RCRA.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past?

Answer: Yes

No

Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI

Yes

Insufficient Data/No

Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site?

Answer: No

Reference Doc(s):

No

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented.

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data

Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Yes

Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control

Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

## Superfund Long-Term Human Health Protection Worksheet

Definition: The Long-Term Human Health Protection EI documents the progress achieved towards providing long-term human health protection by measuring the incremental progress achieved in controlling unacceptable human exposures at a site.

Site Name: WOODBURY CHEMICAL CO.

EPA ID: COD980667075

HE Survey Status: Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to make a HE Determination (if HEID):

Estimated LTHHP will be Achieved:

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

No exposure pathway affecting human health. Property available for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure.

Step 1. Is there sufficient known and reliable information to make an evaluation on human exposures at this site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

No

Insufficient Data to Determine Human Exposure Control Status

Yes

Step 2. Have all human exposure-related cleanup goals been met for the entire site?

Answer: Yes

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved

No

No

Step 3. Are there complete human exposure pathways between contaminated groundwater, surface water, soil, sediment or air media and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

Yes

Step 4. Are the actual or reasonably expected human exposures associated with the complete pathways identified in Step 3 with acceptable limits under current conditions?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Current Human Exposures Not Controlled

Yes

Step 5. Is the site Construction Complete, is the remedy operating as intended, and are engineering and institutional controls, if required, in place and effective?

Answer:

Reference Doc(s):

No

Current Human Exposures Controlled

Yes

Current Human Exposure Controlled and Protective Remedy in Place

Step 6. Are there continuing exposures at the site?

Answer: No Answer "Yes" only if EPA (or a state or PRP) has extended all response actions and legal authorities to prevent unacceptable human exposures, yet exposures continue due to a refusal by the property owner(s) to participate in the remedy (e.g., refusal to accept a municipal water supply hookup) AND the region wishes to exercise its discretion to classify this site as Human Exposure Under Control, consistent with the requirements laid out in the Superfund Environmental Indicators Guidance (OSWER 9285 02, March 2008, pages 4-10 and 4-11).

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

# Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Is the migration of contaminated ground water being controlled through engineered or natural processes?

Site Name: WOODBURY CHEMICAL CO.

EPA ID: COD980667075

GW Survey Status: Not a GW Site

Estimated Under Control Date:

Estimated Date for Sufficient Information to Make a GM Determination (if GMID):

Justification Text: If site status has changed. Please enter a justification as to why the status has changed:

Site available for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure.

Q. Does the site currently have contaminated ground water or did site conditions warrant EPA's investigation or remediation of ground water contamination in the past? Answer: No		No	Stop, you do not need to complete the GM EI
		Yes	
Insufficient Data/No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to ground water been considered in this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):		
		Yes	
Insufficient Data	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control
		Yes	
Insufficient Data	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
		Yes	
Insufficient Data	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bodies? Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	
		Yes	
Insufficient Data	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into the surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e., not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented. Answer: Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
		Yes	
Insufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data ( and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Answer: Not a Groundwater Site Reference Doc(s):	No	Contaminated Ground Water Migration Not Under Control
		Yes	
Insufficient Data to Determine Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control Status			
Contaminated Ground Water Migration Under Control			

Remedial Project Manager Saenz, Armando

Date Completed

